



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

groups rather than to large. A reduction, *e. g.*, in the size of a group of from 33 to 5 resulted in one case in an increase of the bonus from less than 5 per centum to more than 24. It is especially worth noticing that the system introduces a form of competition more fiercely destructive to the inefficient than even the piece-system, as efficient workmen insist on the discharge of the inefficient members of their group.

So far as six experiments extending through brief periods may be taken as justifying a conclusion, the verdict can hardly fail to be favorable to the bonus system, providing the employers are fairly generous in apportioning the dividend, and allowing that in some industries it will not apply at all, because—as in foundries, for example—an increase in the workman's speed is impossible.

A. P. WINSTON.

Eighth Biennial Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of Illinois,
1894. (Taxation.) Springfield, Illinois: State Printer,
1895. 8vo. pp. 491.

THIS report consists of two parts, an exposition of the bad working of the Illinois general property tax, and an argument for replacing the present system with the "Single Tax." The single tax argument exhibits the familiar characteristics of single tax writings: the initial proposition that the poverty of the masses is increasing; the metaphysical argumentation about "justice" and things "natural" and "unnatural;" the implied delusion that a tax imposed on land-rent will in some way fail to detract from the sum of wealth in the community, and the cheerful assurance that the single tax is "the solution of the labor problem." It certainly need not indicate intolerance of Mr. Henry George's views to ask why the public should be made to contribute to the single tax propaganda by paying for an abstract of "Progress and Poverty" under the name of an official report.

The descriptive part of the book is in the main good. It shows that property is undervalued in Chicago as contrasted with the rest of the state. The money in bank, for example, by the assessor's returns, was less in Cook county than in any other of twenty-three counties presented, and so of other property. This results probably from the more intense competition of the city and more strenuous efforts of men in business to figure closely, rather than from native dishonesty.

Good reason is shown for believing that in Chicago fine dwellings

are undervalued more than poor ones, land more than buildings, and vacant land more than land in use. There are, further, the familiar proofs of evasion throughout the state. This is a statement old in substance with a variation as to specific facts. Every one knows the dishonesty and injustice of our tax system, but this does not forbid a fresh demonstration of the evil. Only tedious reiteration can persuade to action an inert public conscience which has long ago been passively persuaded.

A. P. W.

The Mark in Europe and America. A Review of the Discussion on Early Land Tenure. By ENOCH A. BRYAN. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893. 8vo. pp. vii + 164.

MR. BRYAN has rushed in where a more cautious student would fear to tread. It is impossible for a student in the brief space of "a year of rest from his regular duties" to master the immense literature upon the early German village community thoroughly enough to make even "a small contribution to the further consideration of the problem." Moreover, the author approaches his subject in a way calculated to irritate the reader. He tells us that "an historical hypothesis, though it may after a time prove untenable, possesses at any rate the merit of forming a central point for investigation and discussion. But there is a corresponding danger. If once it is fixed in the mind and accepted as standing for a reality, subsequent facts are interpreted in its light and then in turn made to reflect light upon it" (p. 1), and then he proceeds to advocate to the best of his ability the theories of the Coulanges-Seeböhm-Ashley school, as if they were vivid realities.

The question of the social organization of the primitive German village community falls into two parts: (1) The relation of the people to the land; (2) The relation of the people to each other. Did the early Germans hold land in individual or in common ownership? Did the early Germans start free and become serfs, or did they gradually rise out of a condition of serfdom? The former question most occupies our attention in the work before us. Mr. Bryan has no hesitation in expressing his own opinion. He says that the evidence "establishes beyond question the existence of individual landed property from the fourth or fifth century to the present, with a strong probability, to say the least, of its existence in the *Germania* of Tacitus. . . . The evi-